



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Synopses of Important Articles.

---

THE SONG OF SOLOMON. By KARL BUDDE, in the *New World* for March, 1894. Pages 56-78.

No one in these days accepts the allegorical explanation of the Song of Solomon. The latest interpreters, Oettli, Driver, and Rothstein, understand that instead of Jehovah and his people, or Christ and the Soul, the principal characters are Solomon and the Shulamite. The purpose is to show the victory of pure and genuine love over sensual passion. While all agree that the devoted lover is Solomon, opinions differ on the question whether he turns from his passion to genuine love and is rewarded by gaining possession of the Shulamite, or whether he is obliged to surrender her to a rival. For the dramatic construction which is demanded by this theory, the book itself makes no arrangement. It is true, still farther, that the entire Semitic literature does not know the drama. The Book of Job cannot be cited, although it would have much more claim than the Song of Songs. The advocates of the "shepherd hypothesis" should remember "that utterances of the highest sensuality do not become more moral from the fact that they are put into the mouths of unmarried persons, the bride and the bridegroom." They should remember that according to this theory the Shulamite is a most heartless and thorough-going coquette. "A fine drama, this, in which every one talks out of the window, and no one understands another." "A fine king, too—above all, an oriental king—with whom one can sport in this manner without punishment." Still farther, the picture of bridal love is one unknown to the Orient. Close intercourse has never been permitted between the young man and young woman destined for each other in marriage. The explanation which understands the book to treat of bridal love is altogether wrong. The subject of the book is wedded love. A close inspection shows that neither Solomon nor the Shulamite plays a part in the Song of Solomon, and so the whole question of a drama disappears. The fact that Solomon is named proves nothing, for he is also named in Matthew 6:29; 12:42. There is no allusion to Solomon in the Song of Songs which requires him to be still alive. Solomon is only "the typical representation of the highest wealth, splendor and voluptuousness." Something more, however, is demanded in 3:6-11. Here, as in 1:4; 1:12; 5:1; 8:12, application is made to the proverbial person Solomon. The word "Shulamite" occurs only in 7:1. No reference is made in the drama to her home. An explanation of the Shulamite is to be found in the story of Abishag, 1 Kings 1:3 f. But the Shulamite of this book is only the representative of the qualities of Abishag

the Shulamite, declared to be the fairest woman in all Israel. She became the type for women, which Solomon was for men. "As the bridegroom is compared with King Solomon in all his glory, and would not exchange his fortune with Solomon, so for the beauty of the bride no less a woman could be named than the fairest of whom the ancients spoke, and one who was also a queen." It was Wetzstein who published in 1873 the basis for the correct understanding of the book. In his essay, "The Syrian Threshing-board,"<sup>1</sup> he describes the king's week. This is the name given to the first seven days after a marriage, during which time the young husband and wife play king and queen, and are treated as such by their friends. At the end of this week they resume their former position. The young husband in the Song of Solomon is called king, "because the book contains songs for the marriage festival, and the young husband during this time is king." This week is passed in song, sport and dance before a throne which has been set up for the royal pair. Many songs are sung, all of which treat of love. Among others is the so-called *Wasf*, which is sung in praise of the physical beauty of the young couple. The sword dance is sung on the evening of the wedding day. With sword in hand the bride dances before the guests. This is found in 7:1 ff., especially verse 7. The book, when analyzed, furnishes a collection of songs or eulogies. A close application of this theory to the book satisfies many difficulties which otherwise are overwhelming. The songs have been brought together irregularly, and there is no orderly arrangement. Originally the songs were thrown together as a collection without editing. Additions, perhaps, have been made, in order to connect them. It is probable that the reviser, by his insertions, has assisted in the later misunderstanding. The age of the book is probably about 300 B. C. It has no place in a collection of sacred writings. Even the climax of the book, 8:6, 7, does not furnish a basis. Its place among the Holy Scriptures has led to its misunderstanding, and has done great injury. The sensual effect of its words has been great upon many readers. The Jews prohibited its reading before the thirtieth year. The book is not to be despised, for as a memorial of poetry it is most valuable. Its coloring causes a moral recoil, but we must remember that there has come to be a difference of civilization.

---

A more able or ingenious defense of a theory can hardly be imagined. The writer seems to have taken away every prop of the dramatic theory, and to have presented an explanation of the book to which critical objection can hardly be made. But after repeated perusal of the article, one cannot fail to ask himself how it is possible that so great a mistake should have been made about the character and purpose of the collection. And that, too, in the very country in which these same songs are, under the new theory, said to be sung? The audacity of the theory is as great as its plausibility. It goes too far and proves too much. This presentation will doubtless modify our former views, but will not overthrow them.

W. R. H.

<sup>1</sup> *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. 22, pages 287-294.

PROFESSOR W. ROBERTSON SMITH'S DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE. By THOMAS M. LINDSAY, D.D., Glasgow, in the *Expositor* for November, 1894, pages 241-264.

Professor Robertson Smith accepted the reformation idea of the Scriptures rather than that of the mediæval church. The mediæval church accepted the Bible, translated it for the common people, based its theology upon the Scripture, and was ready to accept the Scripture as the judge in any religious controversy. The supreme authority of Scripture was not a distinctive article of the protestant creed in the early centuries. Luther's opponents believed that they would be able to meet his challenge and that the Scripture would decide against him. The controversy showed, however, that Luther had an idea of Scripture which they had not. Their appeal to Scripture was "a balancing of texts, or interpretation of texts, in which everything seemed in an uncertain flux unless backed by the authority of the fathers of the church." But Luther's advantage lay in the fact of his idea of the unity of Scripture, which was unknown in the mediæval church. "Hence the famous decree of Trent, which gave an artificial unity to Scripture by means of a uniform ecclesiastical tradition." The mediæval idea of the Bible as a book full of divine information, or infallible truth about doctrines and morals—an idea which is not uncommon in modern times—cannot cover the long list of genealogies, the descriptions of temple furniture, the details of family life and national history which occupy so large a portion of the Bible. In order to overcome this difficulty the mediæval theologian gave to all these inventories and histories a fourfold meaning. Having thus thrust upon the Scripture indefinite meaning, it was necessary to find outside the Scripture the definite rule of faith. Mediæval theology, "having destroyed the inherent and historical unity of the Bible in favor of a vicious individualism, was compelled to manufacture a fictitious and external unity of Scripture by means of a theory of ecclesiastical tradition, or uniform traditional method of interpreting the meaning of texts."

The beginnings of the reformation doctrine of Scripture spring from religious experience. The reformers found that in the Scripture they had fellowship and communion with God; they found, of course, rules to guide them in all holy living; but what was of more value, this personal fellowship. From every point of view no detail of individual or national life was useless; everything helped to fill in the doctrine of fellowship between God and his people which each one could experience if he had the same faith which the holy men of old had. The biblical records have two sides: they are historical documents, subject to the ordinary career of historical research; they are also the medium whereby the personal God reveals himself to his people. The reformers, holding firmly by the doctrine of the witness of the spirit, could, and did treat the record of the Scripture with great boldness. Calvin confessed, without thinking it necessary to explain, the presence of discrepancies, or even errors—in a guarded sense of the word—in the Sacred Scriptures.

Robertson Smith said, "If I am asked why I receive the Scriptures as the word of God, and the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer with all the fathers of the protestant church, 'because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Jesus Christ, and declaring to us in him his will for our salvation.' And this record I know to be true by the witness of his Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God himself is able to speak such words to my soul." This implies four things: (1) A distinction between the record and the divine communication of God's heart which the record conveys. (2) This distinction is not explained by the illustration of the husk (the record), which can be thrown away, and the kernel (the word), which may be laid hold of. There is no distinction between the Word of God and its record in Scripture which can prevent our saying that *Scripture is the Word of God*. In this phrase everything depends upon the meaning of the word "is." Does it mean logical identity, or may it be interpreted by the word "contained?" Professor Robertson Smith's phrase was "The Scripture records, or conveys, the Word of God." (3) The infallibility and authoritativeness of Scripture belong primarily to the Word of God, and only secondarily to Scripture. This Word of God is the personal manifestation to us of God and his will. This manifestation is given in the course of human events which are a part of human history, in a record which is in outward form like other human writings. It is not a matter of faith in what style a book is written, it is not a matter of faith whether Job is literal history or a poem. These are questions which belong to the human side. The Bible is a part of human literature as well as the record of divine revelation. (4) God has taken special care that the literature should be preserved in order to be a suitable record. The record includes everything necessary to enable us to understand the declaration of God's will. Its adaptation is entirely unaffected by the fact that the text contains marks of human impress. The difference between Professor Smith's views and those of the Princeton school lies in the meaning given the copula "is" in the sentence "The Scripture is the Word of God." The doctrine of the witness of the Spirit which occupied the fore-place in Calvin's doctrine has been left out entirely, or given a subordinate place. In place of the doctrine of Scripture we now have a doctrine of inspiration. This attempts to explain how a literal record may become perfect, infallible, and traditional.

---

Those who desire to know the real position of Professor Robertson Smith, whose influence during the past decade has been so great, should read this article. It is written in a sympathetic spirit, and certainly does justice to Professor Smith's views so far as justice can be done in so short a statement. The distinction between mediæval theology and the reformation theology is worthy of careful study; and the writer's statement, that in these later days the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit has been lost sight of, is true. The discussion of the meaning of the word "is" in the oft-repeated formula is particularly good. No single discussion in the periodical literature of the past year is of greater importance.

W. R. H.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF PAUL. By CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* for April, 1894, pp. 428-474.

The article is based upon a study of 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans and Philippians which are assumed as genuine with Pfleiderer and Weiszäcker. These epistles fill every newcomer with immense astonishment; they are so unique, so wholly unlike anything else he has ever read. Every Jew can understand the synoptics and even the fourth Gospel. But Paul's conception of the law, his theory of Christ, his views about Israel, his doctrine of justification seem all not only original, but utterly strange and unexpected. His break with the past is violent. Jesus seems to expand and spiritualize Judaism, Paul in some sense turns it upside down. His conception of the world, as of his whole philosophy of religion, starts from and ends with God. In this he resembles every other Jew. In his Christology he was essentially a forerunner of Arius.

As regards man, he retains the same two great divisions which were familiar to him before his conversion. Humanity is composed of Jews and gentiles. But with him the prerogatives of the Jews are broken down. The prophetic universalism begun in the first chapters of Genesis has reached its goal. Nevertheless in the eyes of Paul up to his own time nobody has ever known or worshiped the true God except the Jews. What has happened to the gentiles that they were ignorant of God? Here is an inconsistency in Paul's theology which he drew partly from Rabbinic Judaism and partly from Hellenism, such as we find it in the wisdom of Solomon. The Gentile world does not know God, and is not known of him. In Galatians this would seem to be less their fault than their misfortune; in Romans less their misfortune than their fault. Both are equally predetermined by God for his own good purposes. For the gentile idolatry and sin are closely allied.

But also the law is the cause of sin to the Jew, as it came in to magnify, first, the desire to sin, and secondly, increased, by its sheer mass of commandments, the opportunity of sin. The law begets the knowledge of sin. Thus both gentile and Jew are in equal urgent need of redemption by the work of Christ and by the gift of the Spirit.

The main points of Paul's attack upon the law are these: While given apparently for eternity, its real purpose was only temporary. Its seeming object was to make men better, and to qualify them for the kingdom of God; its true object was to create the knowledge and the lust of sin. At its best its intended result was to stimulate a desire for redemption through the medium of a spiritual despair. At its worst it led almost inevitably to self-delusion, hypocrisy and pride. It claims fulfillment, but no man can fulfill it; it demands obedience, but none can obey; it threatens the transgressor with a curse, but it was only given that transgression might abound; it promises the doer of it reward, but the reward is beyond man's power to attain. It assumes that its commands may be obeyed, but the assumption of obedience is more fatal than the consciousness of transgression. Its only end is

death; death for him who tries and knows that he has failed; death to him who tries and thinks that he has accomplished. Truly an awful gift from God. Such is the law, and in this servitude were men held captive from the age of Moses to the age of Christ. Then at the appointed time God redeems man from his bondage to the law and to sin, and gives him righteousness and salvation through Christ's work for man and through man's faith in Christ.

Christ occupied a place midway between man and God, he is more than man, less than God; he is the link between the two; as the head of every man is Christ, so the head of Christ is God. Paul certainly believed in the preëxistence of Christ before his incarnation, but he was nevertheless created by God. The full acknowledgment of Christ's place or office as Son of God seems to date from the resurrection (Rom. 1:4). What his place and office after the grand consummation will be, Paul leaves undetermined. Nor is this reticence unnatural, because Christ's main business concerned man.

For Paul the significance of Christ's work is not that of a great teacher, but it lies almost exclusively in his crucifixion and resurrection; it is essentially miraculous and supernatural, conditioned by his nature; and leads to miraculous and yet ethical transformation in the nature and in the life of man.

What then did Christ do? He freed men from the curse of the law, and abolished it; raised both, gentile and Jew, the one from a state of lawless license, the other from a state of legal sinfulness, into a common higher plane of being from which the ethical portion of the law could be fulfilled. He destroyed sin and won for man eternal life. Man was granted a means which, if he will but use it, enables him, whether Jew or gentile, to be good and to acquire righteousness. This righteousness is given of God, but is also possessed by man; through it salvation and eternal life are within his reach. These results were effected by the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. God could not pardon man without the redeeming death of Christ. The law is satisfied and is also abolished; its object was to create trespass; these trespasses Christ has now atoned for; the business of the law is over.

Faith begins with intellectual acceptance, or rather, perhaps, it begins with unflinching confidence in God and in the Son of God, but it passes over into a kind of ethical devotion. It produces a constancy in sorrow; it implies a constant and watchful zealousness to walk by that Spirit of Christ and God through whose agency faith and goodness were alike possible; it implies not merely a sacrifice of flesh to spirit, but also the abnegation of all selfishness, egoism and pride.

The love of Christ to man rests solely in its proof upon his incarnation and his death; it is closely identified with the love of God. Christ's love is the proof of God's love; his love is revealed in the mission and office of Christ.

In his eschatology Paul is not always consistent; he wrote about these

things as occasion arose; did not deliberately sit down to compose a consistent and connected treatise on eschatology.<sup>1</sup>

Paul's ethics are mainly incidental, but even so they are fairly comprehensive; a firm grasp of the essentials of duty. The believer is a changed creature, glorying only in the cross of Christ; his primal virtue is unselfishness, the source of all his virtues. Devotion to Christ, the consciousness of their high calling and of the possession of the Holy Spirit should exercise a definite ethical effect upon the mind of true believers. The body being the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit, each believer is himself a visible sanctuary of God, and purity in body and mind are the virtues which befit so high a privilege and responsibility. As far as can be gathered from the six epistles Paul's life and character corresponded in fair human measure to the ethical and religious ideal which he enjoins; to him the new faith seemed to involve all virtue. Within the Christian limits there was light; without was darkness—the darkness of idolatry, of unbelief, of sin. Paul's zeal for righteousness and holy living is essentially Jewish. His tremendous enthusiasm for his cause which is at once religious and ethical gives his zeal a glow and fervency peculiarly his own. His hatred of sin is very inspiring; equally striking his grasp upon the essentials of morality. There is unity in his ethics; the virtues hang together. On one or two principles, whether religious or ethical, all seemed to depend. Nor can we forget that the great apostle of faith has yet placed faith below love; a culminating proof that no trace of ethical antinomianism can be elicited from the epistles of Paul.

---

The writer of this article is singularly sympathetic in his discussion of the Pauline teachings free from any animus and displaying a minute acquaintance both with his writings and with the literature to which they have given rise.

W. M.-A.

---

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PETER. By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, in *The New World* for December, 1894. Pp. 690-704.

Controversy about the recently discovered fragment of the Gospel of Peter has dealt chiefly with two points: (1) the sources employed in its creation, and (2) the date of its composition. As to the first of these questions a study of the resemblances of the Gospel of Peter to our canonical gospels clearly points to the use of these gospels by the pseudo-Peter. Thus, in the case of the Fourth Gospel even, we find many striking resemblances in both subject-matter and expression. In dealing with the second question, the relation existing between the works of Justin Martyr and the Gospel of Peter has been appealed to by those who claim an early date for the latter. In *Trypho* 107 Justin says: "And it is said that he changed the name of one

<sup>1</sup> The reading of Kabisch's book, *Die Eschatologie des Paulus*, convinced Montefiore that Paul's eschatology was a more fundamental, far-reaching and pervasive element in his teaching than he had imagined.



of the apostles to Peter, and that this also is written as having taken place *in his memoirs*," etc. On the basis of these words Justin has been said to refer distinctly to the Gospel of Peter. The reference is by no means distinct, however; Justin's other references to the apostolic memoirs are thoroughly satisfied by our canonical gospels; and nothing has been found in the fragment of the Gospel of Peter which we have, to justify this supposed reference to it. At present, then, it is not safe to base anything upon this difficult passage in Justin. The alleged reminiscences of the Gospel of Peter which some have found in Justin are to be explained upon the basis of a common source from which both drew, rather than upon the theory that Justin was pseudo-Peter's debtor.

The conclusions are (1) that pseudo-Peter had and used all four of our canonical gospels, and (2) that there is no evidence to prove that Justin Martyr had the Gospel of Peter to draw from. There remains, then, no valid objection to placing the composition of that gospel about the year 165 A.D.

---

The principal purpose of the article seems to be to meet Dr. Harnack's view that Justin Martyr had and used the Gospel of Peter; a view for which the author finds no substantial evidence. Some, doubtless, will not follow him in his rejection of what seems in Justin a plain allusion to a Petrine Gospel. The article is full of interest, however; the author is quite alive to the important bearing the study of the Akhmīm Fragment has upon certain vexed New Testament questions, and does not lose sight of them; yet he pursues his investigation in a thoroughly dispassionate spirit.

E. J. G.